arXiv:1610.04643v1 [math.LO] 13 Oct 2016

# Arithmetic, Infinite Trees, and Second-order Subsystems: Notes and Observations

David M. Cerna

## 1 Introduction

This paper outlines recent work on alternatives to Second-order arithmetic[2], that is alternative axioms and languages which attain the same expressive power as the Second-order arithmetic axioms and language. The main goal is to remove the second order quantifier and instead work with a single type of quantifier over a very specific term language interpretation. This work is similar to what was done for monadic second-order arithmetic concerning tree automata interpretations, but our concept of decorated trees is quite different[**?**]. Also, we borrow some concepts from array theory[1], such a position and access to make formal the concept of inductive sequences. However, unlike traditional array theory axiomisations positions are not treated as points in an n-dimensional space, but rather each index is treated as a function of a lower dimensional array. Thus, our "arrays" behave more like curried functions than positions in space. These various components come together to provide an alternative formalization where the typical subsystems of second order arithmetic naturally arise. It also provides a natural foundation for consider an alternative second-order theory where our introduced formalism plays the role of the first-order foundation.

## 2 Our language for describing infinite trees

In this paper, we consider infinite rooted complete binary trees where each node is labelled by a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. We will refer to the set of all such trees as $\mathcal{T}$. Such trees can easily be represented by the following recursive definition: $T =: [T\ ;\ T]_{\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}}$, though we will use a different syntactic notation for expressing the labels. A node with an empty label is syntactically represented as $[T\ ;\ T']$, where the left and right children are $T$ and $T'$. Using the introduced notation we can provide a syntactic notation for the tree where every node has an empty label, or what will will refer to as the *empty tree* $\mathbf{0}$. The empty tree is the only tree such that the root has an empty label and both of its children are empty trees, that is $\mathbf{0} = [\mathbf{0}\ ;\ \mathbf{0}]$. Using the empty tree we can introduce the concept of *numeric trees* $\mathcal{N}$, however first we have to introduce the basic successor function that is the *root successor* $\circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$. We make the following propositions about the root successor:

1. If $t \in \mathcal{T}$, then $\mathbf{0} \neq t\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$.
2. If $t, t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ and $t = [t_1\ ;\ t_2]$, then $[t_1\ ;\ t_2]\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \neq [t_1\ ;\ t_2\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}]$ and $[t_1\ ;\ t_2]\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \neq [t_1\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\ ;\ t_2]$.
3. If $t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{T}$m then $t_1\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = t_2\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$ iff $t_1 = t_2$.

Using these constructs and propositions we can define an arithmetic.

### 2.1 Numeric Tree Arithmetic

Notice that the root successor behaves like the successor of Peano arithmetic[3]. However, unlike the definition of natural numbers provided by Robinson arithmetic, we need to first define addition for the root successor before providing a natural definition of numeric trees. The following propositions naturally define addition for the root successor over $\mathcal{T}$:

licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY
Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics
Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

1. If $t, t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{T}$, then $t +_{\mathbf{0}} [t_1 \ ; \ t_2] = t$.
2. If $t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{T}$, then $t_1 +_{\mathbf{0}} t_2 \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = (t_1 +_{\mathbf{0}} t_2) \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$

The only difference between our definition and the standard axiomization of addition is the axiom for addition by "zero", or more correctly a tree with an empty root label. The information contained in the right tree $[t_1 \ ; \ t_2]$ is lost, thus, it is quite obvious that this addition operator is not commutative unless the children of the roots of both trees are equivalent. We can use this to define numerical trees as follows:

1. $t \in \mathcal{N}$ if $t = \mathbf{0}$ or if there exists $t' \in \mathcal{T}$ and $t = \mathbf{0} +_{\mathbf{0}} t' \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$

In other words, numerical trees are trees such that every label is empty but the root label. From now on, we will refer to trees in $\mathcal{N}$ as follows: $\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$, $\mathbf{2} = \mathbf{0} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$, $\mathbf{3} = \mathbf{0} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$, $\cdots$ Now that we have properly defined numerical trees we can use them to define an access operator which allows use to obtain a sub tree from a given tree. The following propositions define the access operator:

1. If $t_1, t_2, t_1', t_2' \in \mathcal{T}$, then $\{[t_1 \ ; \ t_2] \mid [t_1' \ ; \ t_2']\} = t_1$
2. If $t, t_1', t_2' \in \mathcal{T}$, then $\{t \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \mid [t_1' \ ; \ t_2']\} = \{t \mid [t_1' \ ; \ t_2']\} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$
3. If $t_1, t_2, t' \in \mathcal{T}$, then $\{[t_1 \ ; \ t_2] \mid t' \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\} = \{t_2 \mid t'\}$

Notice that the following also holds:

1. If $t, t' \in \mathcal{T}$, then $\{t \mid t'\} = \{t \mid \mathbf{0} +_{\mathbf{0}} t'\}$

thus, we only need to consider numeric trees for the access operator. Even though we have the ability to access the right sub-trees of a tree we have not provide a method for introducing labels to nodes other than the root node. We can define $\mathcal{N}$-successors using the root successor as a base case as follows:

1. If $t_1, t_2, t \in \mathcal{T}$, then $[t_1 \ ; \ t_2] \circlearrowleft_{t \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}} = [t_1 \ ; \ t_2 \circlearrowleft_t]$

Again notice that $t' \circlearrowleft_t = t' \circlearrowleft_{(\mathbf{0} +_{\mathbf{0}} t)}$. Now that we have defined $\mathcal{N}$-successors and the access operator a new type of tree emerges, *functional trees* $\mathcal{F}$. As we did for numerical trees we can describe functional trees using the introduced syntactic language:

1. $t \in \mathcal{F}$ if for all $k \in \mathcal{T}$, $\{t \mid k\} \in \mathcal{N}$

Notice that this definition leaves room for a schema of functional trees definitions, that is we could define $\mathcal{N}$-functional trees as follows:

1. Let $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}$. Then $t \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{n} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}}$ if for all $k \in \mathcal{T}$, $\{t \mid k\} \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{n}}$

We can refer to the set of numerical trees as **0**-functional trees and the set of functional trees as **1**-functional trees. In this paper we will only need constructions up to **2**-functional trees.

## 2.2 Positional Numeric Tree Arithmetic

From the syntactic expressions so far introduced we can give a formal definition of arithmetic over numeric trees, see Table 1. Notice that **NTA** is essentially Peano arithmetic using a different syntactic language. We did not include **n**-successors thus the concept of access does not really make sense. We can extend this arithmetic to include these concepts without adding a stronger sense of induction. We will refer to this extended arithmetic as *Positional* ***NTA*** or **PNTA**. Positional **NTA** can formalize concepts in a similar manor to $\mathbf{ACA}_0$, but is still a conservative extension of **NTA** because it cannot express the totality of these constructions, see Table 2 for the axioms.

An interesting result concerning **PNTA** is that all sentences of the following form are theories of the language.

| Definition of Zero | |
|---|---|
| $\mathbf{0} = [\mathbf{0}\ ;\ \mathbf{0}]$ | Zero definition |
| Successor Axioms | |
| $\forall x\,(\mathbf{0} \neq x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})$ | Uniqueness of $\mathbf{0}$ |
| $\forall x, y\,(x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = y\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \leftrightarrow x = y)$ | Successor injectivity |
| Numeric Addition Axioms | |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(x +_0 [y\ ;\ z] = x)$ | Numeric addition basecase |
| $\forall x, y\,(x +_{\mathbf{0}} y\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = (x +_0 y)\ \circlearrowleft_0)$ | Numeric addition |
| Positional Multiplication Axioms | |
| $\forall x, y, w, r, z, k, l\,([r\ ;\ w] *_{\mathbf{0}} [y\ ;\ z] = [r\ ;\ w])$ | Numeric multiplication basecase |
| $\forall x, w, r\,(x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} *_{\mathbf{0}} [r\ ;\ w] = x *_{\mathbf{0}} [r\ ;\ w])$ | Numeric multiplication middlecase |
| $\forall x, y\,(x *_{\mathbf{0}} y\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = (x *_{\mathbf{0}} y) +_{\mathbf{0}} x)$ | Numeric multiplication |
| Numeric Trees definition | |
| $\forall f(f \in \mathcal{N} \leftrightarrow \exists k(f = \mathbf{0} +_{\mathbf{0}} k\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \vee f = \mathbf{0}))$ | Numeric Trees ($\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{0}}$) |
| Induction | |
| $(P(\mathbf{0}, \bar{y}) \wedge \forall x(x \in \mathcal{N} \wedge P(x, \bar{y}) \rightarrow P(x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}, \bar{y})) \rightarrow \forall x(x \in \mathcal{N} \rightarrow P(x, \bar{y}))$ | $\mathcal{N}$ induction schema |

**Table 1** Numeric Tree Arithmetic (**NTA**).

| Definition of Zero | |
|---|---|
| $\mathbf{0} = [\mathbf{0}\ ;\ \mathbf{0}]$ | Zero definition |
| Successor Axioms | |
| $\forall x\,(\mathbf{0} \neq x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})$ | Uniqueness of $\mathbf{0}$ |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(x\ \circlearrowleft_z = y\ \circlearrowleft_z \leftrightarrow x = y)$ | Successor injectivity |
| $\forall x, y, z\,\left([x\ ;\ y]\ \circlearrowleft_{(z \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})} = [x\ ;\ y\ \circlearrowleft_z]\right)$ | Right association of $\circlearrowleft_z$ |
| Position Axioms | |
| $\forall z, y, m\,(\rightarrow \{[z\ ;\ y] \mid [z\ ;\ m]\} = z)$ | Position access left |
| $\forall y, n, m\,(\{y\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \mid [n\ ;\ m]\} = \{y \mid [n\ ;\ m]\}\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})$ | Position access left |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(\{[z\ ;\ x] \mid y\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\} = \{x \mid y\})$ | Position access right |
| Positional Addition Axioms | |
| $\forall x, y, z, n, m\,(\{y \mid z\} = [n\ ;\ m] \rightarrow x +_z y = x)$ | Positional addition |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(x +_z y\ \circlearrowleft_z = x\ \circlearrowleft_z +_z y)$ | Positional addition |
| Positional Multiplication Axioms | |
| $\forall x, y, w, r, z, k, l\,((\{x \mid z\} = [r\ ;\ w] \wedge \{y \mid z\} = [k\ ;\ l]) \rightarrow x *_{\mathbf{z}} y = x)$ | Positional multiplication |
| $\forall x, y, w, r, z\,(\{y \mid z\} = [r\ ;\ w] \rightarrow x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{z}} *_{\mathbf{z}} y = x *_{\mathbf{z}} y)$ | Positional multiplication |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(x *_z y\ \circlearrowleft_z = (x *_z y) +_z x)$ | Positional multiplication |
| Induction | |
| $(P(\mathbf{0}, \bar{y}) \wedge \forall x(x \in \mathcal{N} \wedge P(x, \bar{y}) \rightarrow P(x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}), \bar{y}) \rightarrow \forall x(x \in \mathcal{N} \rightarrow P(x, \bar{y}))$ | $\mathcal{N}$ induction schema |

**Table 2** Positional Numeric Tree Arithmetic (**PNTA**).

▶ **Theorem 1.** *For all formula $\varphi$ with free variables $x$ and $y$,*

$$\boldsymbol{PNTA} \vdash \exists y \forall x (x \in \mathcal{N} \to \varphi(\{y \mid x\}) \leftrightarrow \exists z (\varphi(x) \wedge \{y \mid z\} = x))$$

**Proof.** This is a simple consequence of the induction axiom schema. ◀

Note that Theorem 1 is essentially the same as the *Arithmetic Comprehension Axiom ($ACA_0$)*. It is well known that Peano Arithmetic extended by the Axiom $\mathrm{ACA}_0$ is a conservative extension of Peano arithmetic. Though, We can work with non-nummeric trees as Theorem 1 shows, we cannot introduce universal quantifiers over functional trees within this theory. To do so, we need to extend the concept of induction to functional trees.

## 2.3 Functional Tree Arithmetic

Now that we have introduced the basic syntactic notation of our language and how this notation is to be interpreted we can intro a stronger notion of induction over **1**-functional trees which we call *Functional Tree Arithmetic (**FTA**)*. Do define induction over **1**-functional trees it is required that we introduce a definition of numeric tree ordering. The ordering is similar to the order typically attributed to Peano arithmetic[3].

$$\forall x, y (x, y \in \mathcal{N} \to (x <_{\mathbf{0}} y \leftrightarrow \exists z (x +_{\mathbf{0}} z \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = y)))$$

Of course, using this definition of ordering, we can define the following abbreviation

$$\forall x, y (x, y \in \mathcal{N} \to (x \leq_{\mathbf{0}} y \leftrightarrow x <_{\mathbf{0}} y \vee x = y))$$

The idea behind **1**-functional trees induction is that we show a given formula holds when the free variable is instantiated with the empty tree. Next we show that if given a function $g$ constructed using successors $\circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}, \cdots, \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{n}}$ the formula holds then the formula holds for the function $g \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{w}}$ where $\mathbf{0} \leq_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{w} \leq_{\mathbf{n}}$. Using the previous statement as an assumption, we show that the formula holds for function $g$ constructed using successors $\circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}, \cdots, \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{n}\circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}}$. Once we have show this to be true we have proven that the formula holds for all **1**-functional trees because we have shown that the theorem holds for arbitrarily complex partially defined functional trees. See Table 3 for the axiom. Now we can make a strong statement than we did when analysing the power **PNTA**.

▶ **Theorem 2.** *For all **PNTA** formula $\varphi(n, f)$, where $n$ and $f$ are free variables, the following holds:*

$$\boldsymbol{FTA} \vdash \exists y \forall x (x \in \mathcal{N} \to \forall f (f \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \to \varphi(\{y \mid x\}, f)) \leftrightarrow$$

$$\exists z (\forall f (f \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \to \varphi(x, f)) \wedge \{y \mid z\} = x)))$$

**Proof.** This is a simple consequence of the functional tree induction axiom schema. ◀

Notice that restricting the formula of Theorem 2 to **PNTA** formula we are restricting the number of universal quantifiers over $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}}$ to zero. Thus, the only universal quantifier over $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}}$ in the formula is the one we introduce. This implies a relationship between Theorem 2 and $\Pi^1_1$-$\mathrm{CA}_0$[2]. However, this is not the only interesting property of **FTA**.

| Definition of Zero | |
|---|---|
| $\mathbf{0} = [\mathbf{0}\ ;\ \mathbf{0}]$ | Zero definition |
| Successor Axioms | |
| $\forall x\,(\mathbf{0} \neq x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})$ | Uniqueness of $\mathbf{0}$ |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(x\ \circlearrowleft_z = y\ \circlearrowleft_z \leftrightarrow x = y)$ | Successor injectivity |
| $\forall x, y, z\,\left([x\ ;\ y]\ \circlearrowleft_{(z \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})} = [x\ ;\ y\ \circlearrowleft_z]\right)$ | Right association of $\circlearrowleft_z$ |
| Position Axioms | |
| $\forall z, y, m\,(\rightarrow \{[z\ ;\ y] \mid [z\ ;\ m]\} = z)$ | Position access left |
| $\forall y, n, m\,(\{y\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \mid [n\ ;\ m]\} = \{y \mid [n\ ;\ m]\}\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})$ | Position access left |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(\{[z\ ;\ x] \mid y\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\} = \{x \mid y\})$ | Position access right |
| Positional Addition Axioms | |
| $\forall x, y, z, n, m\,(\{y \mid z\} = [n\ ;\ m] \rightarrow x +_z y = x)$ | Positional addition |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(x +_z y\ \circlearrowleft_z = x\ \circlearrowleft_z\ +_z y)$ | Positional addition |
| Positional Multiplication Axioms | |
| $\forall x, y, w, r, z, k, l\,((\{x \mid z\} = [r\ ;\ w] \wedge \{y \mid z\} = [k\ ;\ l]) \rightarrow x *_{\mathbf{z}} y = x)$ | Positional multiplication |
| $\forall x, y, w, r, z\,(\{y \mid z\} = [r\ ;\ w] \rightarrow x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{z}} *_{\mathbf{z}} y = x *_{\mathbf{z}} y)$ | Positional multiplication |
| $\forall x, y, z\,(x *_z y\ \circlearrowleft_z = (x *_z y) +_z x)$ | Positional multiplication |
| Positional Addition Axioms | |
| $\forall x, y (x, y \in \mathcal{N} \rightarrow (x <_{\mathbf{0}} y \leftrightarrow \exists z (x +_{\mathbf{0}} z\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = y)))$ | Numerical ordering |
| $\forall x, y (x, y \in \mathcal{N} \rightarrow (x \leq_{\mathbf{0}} y \leftrightarrow x <_{\mathbf{0}} y \vee x = y))$ | Numerical ordering |
| Induction | |
| $(P(\mathbf{0}, \bar{y}) \wedge \forall x (x \in \mathcal{N} \wedge P(x, \bar{y}) \rightarrow P(x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}), \bar{y}) \rightarrow \forall x (x \in \mathcal{N} \rightarrow P(x, \bar{y}))$ | $\mathcal{N}$ induction schema |
| $(P(\mathbf{0}, \bar{y}) \wedge \forall x (x \in \mathcal{N} \wedge \Omega(P, x) \rightarrow \Omega(P, x\ \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})) \rightarrow \forall x (x \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \Rightarrow P(x, \bar{y}))$ | $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}}$ induction |
| $\forall g \forall w \left(\left(g \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \wedge P(g, \bar{y}) \wedge \forall r\,(n <_{\mathbf{0}} r \rightarrow \mathbf{0} = \{g \mid r\}) \wedge w \leq_{\mathbf{0}} n\right) \rightarrow P(g\ \circlearrowleft_w, \bar{y})\right)$ | $\Omega(P, n)$ |

**Table 3** Functional Tree Arithmetic (**FTA**).

## 2.4 Application Operator

An operation with is not normally definable within an arithmetic theory is that of recursive concatenation of functions. The reason for this is that for the most part accessing a position within a function is not as explicit as our system and not as fundamental. We extend the language with an application operator which allows recursive concatenation. It is defined as follows

| Application Operator Axioms | |
|---|---|
| $\forall x, y, z \left(x \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \wedge y \in \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \langle x \ : \ y : \ \mathbf{0}\rangle = \{x \mid y\}\right)$ | Function application |
| $\forall x, y, z \left(x \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \wedge y, z \in \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \langle x \ : \ y : \ z \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\rangle = \{x \mid \langle x \ : \ y : \ z\rangle\}\right)$ | Function application |

The application operator is very similar to the recursion operator of system T and construction of the Grzegorczyk hierarchy. We now prove important properties of the application operator.

▶ **Theorem 3.**

$$\mathbf{FTA} \models \forall h \forall k (k \in \mathcal{N} \wedge h \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \rightarrow \exists f (f \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \wedge \{f \mid k\} = \langle h \ : \ k : \ k\rangle)).$$

**Proof.** Let us begin by considering the case when both $k$ and $h$ are zero. That is the statement

$$\exists f (f \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \wedge \{f \mid \mathbf{0}\} = \langle \mathbf{0} \ : \ \mathbf{0} : \ \mathbf{0}\rangle)$$

Obviously this is satisfiable by $f = \mathbf{0}$. Now let us consider for our induction hypothesis ($\mathcal{N}$ induction) that the statement holds for $\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{r}$ and show for $\mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$. That is

$$\forall \mathbf{r} \exists f (\mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} \in \mathcal{N} \rightarrow f \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \wedge \{f \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\} = \langle \mathbf{0} \ : \ \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} : \ \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\rangle)$$

Again this is easily satisfied by $f = \mathbf{0}$. Now let us assume that the theorem holds for all $h \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k = \mathbf{0}$. We show that it holds $h' = h \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$. That is

$$\exists f' (h \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \rightarrow f \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{1}} \wedge \{f' \mid \mathbf{0}\} = \langle h' \ : \ \mathbf{0} : \ \mathbf{0}\rangle)$$

We know that $\langle h' \ : \ \mathbf{0} : \ \mathbf{0}\rangle = \{h' \mid \mathbf{0}\} = \{h \mid \mathbf{0}\} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = \langle h \ : \ \mathbf{0} : \ \mathbf{0}\rangle \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} = \{f \mid \mathbf{0}\} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$ . Thus, we have that $\{f' \mid \mathbf{0}\} = \{f \mid \mathbf{0}\} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$ and we have shown that the statement holds.

For the last step of the functional induction basecase, we assume that the statement holds for all $h \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathbf{m} \leq_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{r}$ and show that the statement hold for $\mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}$. We know that, by definition $\langle h \ : \ \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} : \ \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\rangle = \{h \mid \langle h \ : \ \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} : \ \mathbf{r}\rangle\}$. We know by the induction hypothesis that there exists $\{g \mid \mathbf{r}\} = \langle h \ : \ \mathbf{r} : \ \mathbf{r}\rangle$. By definition of $h$ there are two possible values of $\{g \mid \mathbf{r}\}$, that is $\{g \mid \mathbf{r}\} = \mathbf{0}$ or $\{g \mid \mathbf{r}\} = \mathbf{n}$. If $\{g \mid \mathbf{r}\} = \mathbf{0}$, then by the definition of $h$ we know that $\{g \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\} = \mathbf{0}$. This would imply that $\langle h \ : \ \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} : \ \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\rangle = \{h \mid \langle h \ : \ \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}} : \ \mathbf{r}\rangle\} = \{h \mid \mathbf{0}\}$. If $\{g \mid \mathbf{r}\} = \mathbf{n}$ then, $\{g \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\} = \mathbf{0}$ again. As a result we see that constructing $f$ from $g$ is possible and we get that $\{f \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\} = \{h \mid \{g \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}\}\}$ and thus we have proven the functional basecase.

For the functional step case we assume that the theorem holds for functions $h$ built from the successor operators $\circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}}, \cdots, \circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{m}}$ and show that it holds for theorems built from successor operators $\circlearrowleft_0, \cdots, \circlearrowleft_{(\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})}$. We need to show that the theorem holds for

$$h' = \left[\mathbf{0} \ ; \ \left[\mathbf{0} \ ; \ \cdots [\mathbf{0} \ ; \ \mathbf{0}] +_0 \mathbf{n}_{(\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_{\mathbf{0}})} \cdots\right] +_0 \mathbf{n_1}\right] +_0 \mathbf{n_0},$$

where $\mathbf{n_0}, \cdots, \mathbf{n}_{(\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0})} \in \mathbb{F}^0$ We know that the theorem holds for

$$h = [\mathbf{0}\ ;\ [\mathbf{0}\ ;\ \cdots [\mathbf{0}\ ;\ \mathbf{0}] +_0 \mathbf{n_m} \cdots] +_0 \mathbf{n_1}] +_0 \mathbf{n_0}.$$

This means that for all $\mathbf{k}$ there exists $f$ such that $\{f \mid \mathbf{k}\} = \langle h\ :\ \mathbf{k} :\ \mathbf{k}\rangle$ and a $g = \langle h\ :\ \mathbf{k} :\ \mathbf{r}\rangle$, where $\mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{k}$. When $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}$, we have $\{f \mid \mathbf{0}\} = \langle h\ :\ \mathbf{0} :\ \mathbf{0}\rangle = \{h \mid \mathbf{0}\}$. Thus, we can compute $h'$ by computing $h +_{(\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0})} \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}}$. Also, $f'$ is defined as $\{f' \mid \mathbf{0}\} = \langle h\ :\ \mathbf{0} :\ \mathbf{0}\rangle = \{h' \mid \mathbf{0}\}$.

Let us assume the theorem holds for $\mathbf{k} \leq_\mathbf{0}^\mathbf{0} \mathbf{r}$ and show that it holds for $\mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}$. Let us consider $\{f \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\} = \{h \mid \{g' \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\}\}$ where $\{g' \mid \mathbf{r}\} = \langle h'\ :\ \mathbf{r} :\ \mathbf{r}\rangle$. The value $\{g' \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\}$ can be one of the following: $\{g' \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\} = \mathbf{0}$, $\{g' \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\} = \mathbf{m} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}$, or $\{g' \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\} \leq_\mathbf{0} \mathbf{m} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}$. If $\{g' \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\} = \mathbf{0}$ then we can we can replace $h$ by $h'$ without problem and the theorem holds. If $\{g' \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\} = \mathbf{m} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}$ then $\{h \mid \mathbf{m} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, Thus, we can compute $h'$ by computing $h +_{(\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0})} \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}}$. The result is $\left\{h +_{(\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0})} \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}} \;\middle|\; \mathbf{m} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\right\} = \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{m}\circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}} = \{h' \mid \mathbf{m} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\}$. If $\{g' \mid \mathbf{r} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}\} \leq_\mathbf{0} \mathbf{m} \circlearrowleft_\mathbf{0}$ then replacing $h$ by $h'$ would not effect the construction and thus we have proving the step case and that the theorem holds for all functions of $\mathcal{F}^\mathbf{1}$. ◀

The following is a simple corollary of the above theorem

▶ **Theorem 4.** **FTA** $\models \forall h(h \in \mathcal{F}^\mathbf{1} \to \exists f(f \in \mathcal{F}^\mathbf{1} \wedge \forall k(k \in \mathcal{N} \to \{f \mid k\} = \langle h\ :\ k :\ k\rangle)))$

**Proof.** This theorem is a simple application of functional induction to the results of Theorem 3. ◀

▶ **Theorem 5.** **FTA** $\models \forall f \exists h(f \in \mathcal{F}^\mathbf{1} \to \forall k(k \in \mathcal{N} \to \{f \mid k\} = \langle \{h \mid k\}\ :\ k :\ k\rangle))$

**Proof.** We introduce the universal quantification on the f using functional tree induction and the $k$ by numeric tree induction. For introducing the existential quantifier we need the construction of *pseudo-numeric trees* $\mathcal{N}^\mathcal{P}$, that is a function $f$ with the following property:

$$\forall f(f \in \mathcal{N}^\mathcal{P} \leftrightarrow f \in \mathcal{F}^\mathbf{1} \wedge \exists y(y \in \mathcal{N} \wedge \forall k(\{f \mid k\} = y)))$$

It is pretty easy to see that for every $y \in \mathcal{N}$ there is a pseudo-numeric tree for $y$. Pseudo-numeric trees have the following property concerning the application operator:

$$\forall f(f \in \mathcal{N}^\mathcal{P} \to \forall n, m(n, m \in \mathcal{N} \to \langle f\ :\ n :\ m\rangle = \{f \mid \mathbf{0}\})$$

What we can gather from this is that $h$ is a tree such that $\{h \mid k\} = g$, $g \in \mathcal{N}^\mathcal{P}$, and $\{g \mid k\} = \{f \mid k\}$. Obviously such a tree suffices and the theorem holds. Also, such trees is obvious constructable in **FTA**. ◀

Theorem 5 is extremely strong in that it implies that any level of transfinite recursion can be applied. Thus, we see that **FTA** is at least as expressive as $\text{ATR}_0$. To prove that this is actually the case, we need a much stronger arithmetic then **FTA**, what we refer to as *Function sequence Arithmetic ( **FSA**)*, which is arithmetic over **2**-functional trees. Such an arithmetic has a strong induction schema which can prove the statement:

$$\mathbf{FSA} \models \forall h(h \in \mathcal{F}^\mathbf{2} \to \exists f(f \in \mathcal{F}^\mathbf{1} \wedge \forall k(k \in \mathcal{N} \to \{f \mid k\} = \langle \{h \mid k\}\ :\ k :\ k\rangle)))$$

This statement easily implies transfinite induction up to the $ATR_0$ level[2]. Though, without going further, notice that we have introduced systems capable of expressing subsystems of second order arithmetic up to $\Pi^1_1$-$\text{CA}_0$. Also, there is no reason why we cannot easily adjust our formalism to express $\Pi^1_k$-$\text{CA}_0$. However, $\Pi^1_\omega$-$\text{CA}_0$ is out of reach because we cannot sets

of sets within **FTA**. Though, we do not provide proof in this short exposition, notice that we have essentially introduced an alternative formalism as strong as second-order arithmetic without adding quantification over sets. Though, one could say our quantifier is intrinsically over sets, or functions for that matter, but we introduce restrictions that limit the set like properties, thus in some sets it is an arithmetic over *pseudo-sets* or more correctly sequences.

## References


1 AaronR. Bradley, Zohar Manna, and HennyB. Sipma. What's decidable about arrays? In E.Allen Emerson and KedarS. Namjoshi, editors, *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation*, volume 3855 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 427–442. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.

2 Stephen G. Simpson. *Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic:*. Cambridge, 2 edition, 005 2009.

3 Gaisi Takeuti. *Proof Theory*, volume 81 of *Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics*. American Elsevier Pub., 1975.